

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/614,682	CIARELLI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Frederick J. Parker	1762	

All Participants:
Status of Application: RCE

 (1) Frederick J. Parker.

(3) _____.

 (2) Gordon Harris Jr

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 10-3-05
Time: 3 PM
Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☒ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

17

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.


SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

The Examiner inquired as to the meaning of the top of P.18, Spec. We agreed it was unclear and to specify the internal pinch valve portion 210 was cleaned in 540. We also agreed arrow showing elements 540 in Fig. 6 was confusing and to substitute brackets instead, per TP [0049] support. In claim 17, specifying on L.10 the purge fitting between the color valve and powder source was agreed upon, as was deletion of "adapted to be". Such specificity was noted to clearly distinguish over the prior art.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)